UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE MATTER OF SHAPES/ARCH HOLDINGS, LLC, ET AL., Debtor.

Camden, New Jersey April 17, 2008

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE GLORIA M. BURNS, UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Trustee:

PETER D'AURIA, ESQUIRE

Office of the

United States Trustee

1 Newark Center

Suite 2100

Newark, New Jersey 07102

For the Debtor:

MARK E. FELGER, ESQUIRE

Cozen O'Connor Suite 300 Libertyview

457 Haddonfield Road

Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002

For the Committee:

ALAN HALPERIN, ESQUIRE

Halperin, Battaglia, Raicht, LLP

555 Madison Avenue

9th Floor

New York, New York 10022

MICHAEL SIROTA, ESQUIRE

Cole Schotz 25 Main Street

Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

For Arch Acquisition I:

ALAN BRODY, ESQUIRE DIANE VUOCOLO, ESQUIRE Greenberg Traurig, 200 Park Avenue

Florham Park, New Jersey

Case 08-14631-GMB Doc 195 Filed 04/22/08 Entered 04/22/08 16:52:36 Desc Main Document Page 2 of 113

APPEARANCES (continued):

For Arcus ASI Funding, LLC; Arcus ASI, Inc.:

JOEL C. SHAPIRO, ESQUIRE c/o Matthew Rottenberg Blank Rome, LLP 210 Lake Drive East

210 Lake Drive East Cherry Hill, New Jersey

For Pennsauken Township:

OREN KLEIN, ESQUIRE Parker McCay, P.A.

route 73 and Greentree Road Marlton, New Jersey 08053

For Quickway, Inc.:

KATHLEEN COLLINS, ESQUIRE

Litchfield Cavo, LLP

Commerce Center

1800 West Chapel Avenue

Suite 360

Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002

For Ward Sand & Materials Co., Inc.:

LOUIS GIANSANTE, ESQUIRE Giansante & Cobb, LLC 23 East Main Street

Moorestown, New Jersey 08057

For Pollution Control Financing Authority of Camden County: JOSEPH M. GAREMORE, ESQUIRE Brown & Connery, LLP 6 North Broad Street Woodbury, New Jersey 08096

For Avery Dennison, Prince Foods, Crowley Corp., The Glidden Court., Georgia-Pacific Court, SEPTA, Sears, Garrett-Buchanan:

DEBORAH L. SHUFF, ESQUIRE Drinker, Biddle & Reath, LLP One Logan Square 18th and Cherry Streets Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

For Wells Fargo Equipment and Jaguar Credit:

JOHN MORTON, ESQUIRE 110 Marter Avenue Suite 301 Moorestown, New Jersey 08057

For SL Industries, Inc.:

ROBYN F. POLLACK, ESQUIRE Saul Ewing, LLP 1500 Market Street 38th Floor

Centre Square West

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

Case 08-14631-GMB Doc 195 Filed 04/22/08 Entered 04/22/08 16:52:36 Desc Main Document Page 3 of 113

Audio Operator:

MARY LAMPONE

Transcribed by:

DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING

P. O. Box 129

Gibbsboro, New Jersey 08026 Off: (856) 435-7172 Fax: (856) 435-7124

Email: <u>dianadoman@comcast.net</u>

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

INDEX

ARGUMENT:

By: Mr. Felger 8, 12, 39

By: Mr. Halperin 26

By: Mr. Sirota 42

By: Mr. Brody 47

By: Mr. D'Auria 52

By: Mr. Shapiro 53

THE COURT:

Ruling 12, 56, 93

Colloguy CLERK: -- the Honorable Gloria M. Burns presiding. 1 2 THE COURT: Please be seated. Good morning. MR. FELGER: Good morning, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Felger. 4 MR. FELGER: Mark Felger of Cozen O'Connor on behalf 5 of the debtors. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. If you just want to hold on 8 for one minute before I get everybody's appearance. I have somebody on the phone. (Pause). Mr. Drew? 9 MR. DREW: Yes. 10 THE COURT: This is Judge Burns, and you're on in the 11 courtroom in the matter of Shapes/Arch Holdings. 12 I would 13 appreciate it if you would put your appearance on the record. 14 And, then, if, during the course of the proceedings, you have 15 any difficulty in hearing, if you would just shout out. 16 try to get somebody to move closer to the microphone. 17 MR. DREW: Okay.

Thank you, Your Honor. James Drew from Curtis Mallet on behalf of Glen Core (phonetic) Limited. Also on the line I believe is Alyssa Golab (phonetic) from Glen Core.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Good morning. Other appearances, please? MR. HALPERIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Alan Halperin, Halperin, Battaglia, Raicht, on behalf of the Committee.

MR. SIROTA: Judge, good morning. Michael Sirota,

Colloguy

1 Cole Schotz, co-counsel for the Committee.

MR. BRODY: Good morning, Your Honor. Alan Brody and
Diane Vuocolo from Greenberg Traurig on behalf of Arch
Acquisition I, LLC.

MR. SHAPIRO: Good morning, Your Honor. Joel Shapiro, Blank Rome, on behalf of Arcus ASI Funding, LLC.

MR. MORTON: John Morton for Wells Fargo Equipment Finance and Jaguar Credit.

MR. KLEIN: Oren Klein of Parker McCay on behalf of Pennsauken Township.

MR. D'AURIA: Good morning, Your Honor. Peter D'Auria from the United States Trustee's Office.

THE COURT: Good morning everyone. Other appearances?

MR. GIANSANTE: Good morning, Your Honor. Louis Giansante on behalf of Ward Sand and Materials Company.

THE COURT: Could you just slow down a little bit so I can get your appearance again?

MR. GIANSANTE: It's Louis Giansante on behalf of Ward Sand and Materials Company.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. POLLACK: Good morning, Your Honor. Robyn Pollack, Saul Ewing, on behalf of SL Industries.

MS. SHUFF: Good morning, Your Honor. Deborah Shuff, Drinker, Biddle & Reath, on behalf of Sears Holding Management

Colloquy

Corporation, Georgia-Pacific, The Glidden Company, Avery Dennison, Borden Foods, Crowley Corporation, Garrett Buchanan, and SEPTA.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MS. COLLINS: Good morning, Your Honor. Kathleen Collins on behalf of Quickway, Inc. from Litchfield Cavo.

MR. GAREMORE: Good morning, Your Honor. Joseph Garemore from the Brown & Connery firm on behalf of the Pollution Control Financing Authority of Camden County.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. D'AURIA: Your Honor, may I make a disclosure, please?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. D'AURIA: I would like to inform the Court that Mr. Garemore is from the Brown & Connery firm. A partner of that firm named Paul Mainardi is my second cousin. For whatever that's worth, I made the disclosure.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, --

MR. D'AURIA: Thank you.

THE COURT: -- Mr. D'Auria. I'm not really -- unless somebody has an objection right now, I'm not that concerned.

But, I appreciate your bringing it to the Court's attention.

MR. D'AURIA: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Felger?

MR. FELGER: The debtors have no concern about that,

Your Honor. Good morning again, Your Honor. It seems appropriate just to take matters up in the order that they're presented on the amended agenda.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FELGER: The first item is the -- an amended motion by the debtors to employ and compensate certain professionals in the ordinary course of business. It's a rather routine motion. And, we had to amend it because there were certain items that needed to be clarified from the motion that was initially filed. It was our intention to -- to include this as a first day motion. But, unfortunately we just weren't able to -- to pull it together and identify all the folks we needed or we thought we ought to identify in the motion.

We've served this out on all parties. No objections have been filed. We've spoken with counsel for the Committee, and I believe they have no objection to the entry of the order approving that motion. I believe we filed a certificate of no objection yesterday. And, I'm not sure whether Your Honor has had a chance to enter that order or -- if not, if Your Honor has any questions with respect to that motion, we're happy to address them this morning.

THE COURT: Well, to be truthful, with everything else I've been looking at, I didn't spend a lot of time because I know it's uncontested. They seem to be -- oh, did you have a

1 | ques -- did you have an objection, Mr. D'Auria?

MR. D'AURIA: No, not an objection, Your Honor. I just wanted to inform the Court that the -- the order attached to the amended motion is different from the order to the first motion. And, some of the changes were in response to concerns our office raised.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, make sure that, --

MR. D'AURIA: So, --

THE COURT: Chris, when you pull it out, that it's the amended order.

MR. D'AURIA: And, that amended order solves our concerns.

THE COURT: And, what were those concerns that you -- that have now been addressed?

MR. D'AURIA: They were done by my colleague, Your Honor. But, I believe it -- it involved the ability to look back at fees paid at the end of the day under 330.

THE COURT: Is that your understanding?

MR. FELGER: It was likewise done by a colleague of mine. So, -- that sounds right though, Your Honor.

MR. D'AURIA: That was a crux of it, Your Honor. There may have been another change in the middle of the document, but that was the crux of it.

THE COURT: Unfortunately, I don't have another colleague that will look at things for me, so I have to look at

them myself. And, if there's any question, we'll reach out to you, Mr. Felger. I just really kind of scanned what you were looking at. I didn't know that the U.S. Trustee had concerns. I'm glad they were addressed. But, perhaps, when I look at the two orders, I'll be able to understand what the -- what the differences were.

MR. D'AURIA: If I remember correctly, Your Honor, the last paragraph of the order on the amended motion --

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. D'AURIA: -- was an addition that didn't appear in the first one.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. D'Auria. I'll look at it when I finish today. And, if there's any question, Mr. Felger, I'll have somebody reach out to you.

MR. FELGER: That sounds right, Your Honor. I'm looking at the final order now -- I mean, the final paragraph of the order now. And, it provides that the final statement is served upon notice parties, and they shall have 20 days to file an objection. So, that seems to address the concern that the U.S. Trustee just raised.

The second matter on our amended agenda, Your Honor, is a -- a motion for authority to continue certain customer practices and programs. Again, this is another motion that we had hoped to pull together and include as a first day motion given the issues that are raised in that motion with respect to

Felger - Argument

the debtor's ability to continue to honor what are recognized as standard customer programs and practices in the respective industries of the debtors.

The facts are all pretty well set forth in the motion, and the motion is verified. I have spoken with counsel for the Committee who has indicated to me they have no objection to the entry of an order granting that relief. And, again, it's -- it's simply to authorize the debtors to continue with its ordinary course customer practices and programs --

THE COURT: Involving warranty claims, and --

MR. FELGER: Exactly.

THE COURT: -- repairs, and those kind of things.

MR. FELGER: Replacement parts to retail -- to distributors and customers. And, also honoring -- to the extent they're pre-petition claims, I think what we've set out is that we believe the total among the various programs for un -- for pre-petition unsecured claims would be less than \$110,000.

THE COURT: And, the Committee is not --

MR. HALPERIN: We have no objection, Your Honor.

THE COURT: No problem with that? Mr. D'Auria, anything from the U.S. Trustee?

MR. D'AURIA: I reviewed it myself. No objection,
Your Honor. It's purely the continuation of a warranty
program. There's not a -- there's not a payment of a pre-

The Court - Ruling / Felger - Argument petition claim. I didn't view it to be akin to a critical

2 vendor motion.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. There's been no objection. I'll look over the form of the order. And, if there's not any problem with it, the order will be entered.

MR. FELGER: And, that brings us to the reason why I think everybody is here today, and that's items 3 and 4. And, I think it's -- given what -- where the debtors are and what the debtor is requesting, it probably makes sense to take up both matters together.

What the debtors are requesting, Your Honor, is an adjournment of both of these matters for a short time. We've talked with the parties about a date for the adjourned hearing, and it's something we -- we need obviously to take up with Your Honor. But, we were looking at something relatively short into the latter part of next week or perhaps the following Monday. And, it could very well be that the following Monday works best for the folks --

THE COURT: The problem with the following Monday is --

MR. FELGER: Okay.

THE COURT: -- that that is the first day of the Third Circuit Conference, and I will not be here.

MR. FELGER: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: So, -- I won't be here. I'll only be

here -- the week after next I'm only going to be here one day.

And, I -- I don't know that this is what I can do in that one day, to be honest, because I'm going to be in -- in Maryland Monday through Wednesday, and I'm going to be at the bench bar conference on Friday. I guess, if I had to, I could miss that.

But, I'm already scheduled to be at the Circuit Conference.

So, --

MR. FELGER: Well, it sounds like Mr. Sirota's crystal ball was working yesterday, because he suspected that's where you may be. So, I guess we'll have to talk -- after we get through what everybody wants to say on the record -- an appropriate date to reschedule these two matters. So, I guess we can take that up at the end.

In light of the objections filed to the -- to the DIP financing motion -- I think there were four or five -- and the dozen or so objections that were filed to the disclosure statement, we thought, in discussion with Versa and CIT, our DIP lenders -- and Versa, our plan funder -- that it made sense to adjourn both of those matters for a -- a short period of time to hopefully address all of the objections and file an amended plan and disclosure statement that, if not -- that would, if not eliminate all objections, would certainly whittle them down to a manageable few.

We've reached out to the Committee to indicate that that was our intent to ask the Court for an adjournment. And,

Felger - Argument

it was -- it was our desire to not only adjourn, but to perhaps have a chambers conference with Your Honor with respect to sort of where we are and what some of the critical issues are.

The -- the Committee's response to our request for the adjournment was that they'd be fine with an adjournment provided certain things happened before the adjourned hearing.

And, what I'd like to do is walk -- walk through those items that the Committee wanted to see happen before -- before we got to an adjourned hearing.

At the time when we approached them, we hadn't yet decided whether we were going to adjourn the disclosure statement hearing. So, one of their points was that they would want both the disclosure statement hearing and the DIP financing motion adjourned to an acceptable date for all parties. And, that one we had no problem with.

The next point on their list was they wanted the ability to depose three individuals before the adjourned hearing. From the debtor's side, the two individuals who testified at the first day hearing, Steve Grabell the CEO, and Vince Collistra, a principal of Phoenix. And, the third person was a representative -- or is a representative of Versa, Arcus, and that's Paul Halpern (phonetic).

The -- in talking with Mr. Shapiro, counsel for Versa, Versa and the debtors are fine with producing those three witnesses at a -- at a mutually convenient time before

Felger - Argument

the adjourned hearing. So, that one was acceptable to the debtors and Versa.

The third point they -- they raised was that they wanted a -- a full response to their 2004 subpoena that they served, I guess, about ten days ago. Over the course of the last ten days, we've been sharing a great deal of information, notwithstanding their allegation that we've given them a handful of documents. We've given them quite a bit of information over the past ten days.

But, admittedly, we haven't fully responded to that subpoena. So, what I have said to them is we will endeavor to produce the documents that have been requested. I indicated that some of the requests are extremely broad and that we need to put our heads together to try to get to a meeting of the minds as to exactly what the Committee is looking for with respect to some of the items.

For instance, one of the items was give us everything you have in support of every allegation in your DIP financing motion. There's a hundred paragraphs in that motion. So, we need to -- we need to talk and --

THE COURT: Try to sit down and -- and --

MR. FELGER: Yeah, I've spoken --

THE COURT: -- tone down the -- what the scope of that area is.

MR. FELGER: We had a -- I spoke with Ilana Volkov,

Felger - Argument

Mr. Sirota's partner, last week. And, we went through them one by one. And, there was an acknowledgment by Ms. Volkov that there were a couple of them that she needed to get back to me on to try to focus in on what -- what we're -- what they're looking for.

So, we've -- we've agreed to -- to work diligently to get them the additional information they'll need in response to their subpoena, recognizing we're not waiving any privilege, work product, that sort of thing. And, if we need to raise those issues, we'll raise them, and Your Honor will decide.

So, I don't believe that one is going to be an issue. Again, we're going to -- we're going to work with them and endeavor to get them everything -- everything they need. And, if we don't, I'm sure they'll be reaching out to Your Honor on that one.

The fourth point was that they wanted to have us file an amended plan and amended disclosure statement and any response to their objections by this Friday. As Your Honor is aware, Arcus has already filed their response to their -- to their objections. And, unfortunately, standing here today, I have not read their response. But, at least in that respect, Arcus has already gone on record with their response.

We are fine with filing an amended plan and amended disclosure statement and the debtor's response -- and there will be a response -- to the objections reasonably in advance

Felger - Argument

of the adjourned hearing date. Friday would be fine if we were looking a hearing next Tuesday or Wednesday. But, depending on where -- where we come out, if it's a later hearing, we'd probably want until Monday or Tuesday of next week. So, I think it's all going to track off of what the adjourned hearing date is in terms of filing our amended plan and disclosure statement.

We had an amended plan and disclosure statement with some pretty significant changes ready to go. But, in light of all of the objections that have come in over the last couple of days, including a very comprehensive objection by the Committee just yesterday, additional changes to the plan and disclosure statement will be made. And, --

THE COURT: To mean that we adjourn -- I want to -I'm going to bring up a few things that I think you need to
address in your disclosure statement, some of which were
addressed and some of which weren't. And, we might as well at
least get into some of that now because, if I'm going to be
looking at an amended disclosure statement, we might as well
take into account as many of the things that are of concern to
the Court as possible.

MR. FELGER: Absolutely. The last item that the Committee wanted to see happen -- and, it was -- and, it's an item that the debtors did not agree to and Versa did not agree to, and that's to provide HIG or Arch Acquisition I documents

Felger - Argument

that they have requested as due diligence for an alternative DIP and their proposed alternative plan. And, -- so, I think the reason we're here today is that issue.

They've asked us to produce those documents. Mr. Halperin has asked me a half a dozen times to produce those documents and has indicated that I may be breaching my fiduciary duties if I'm not producing those documents. And, I have Arcus saying the exact opposite.

I know I'm in a difficult spot when Mr. Shapiro is telling me it's a no brainer, and Mr. Halperin is telling me it's a no brainer. So, I'd like to give a little flavor on where we are on that issue and then let Mr. Halperin or Mr. Sirota and Shapiro give their views.

THE COURT: You could -- if you would start by telling me the essence of what it is that they're looking for that you -- and why you have a problem with supplying it.

MR. FELGER: Okay.

THE COURT: Assuming that -- I did read somewhere that Arch at one time had signed a confidentiality agreement. So, I'm assuming that any disclosure now would be subject to the same dis -- same confidentiality agreements --

MR. FELGER: The --

THE COURT: -- or is that the question?

MR. FELGER: They did -- I guess I'll start with -- start -- I wasn't going to start there, but we'll start there.

Felger - Argument

HIG, Arch Acquisition I, has a portfolio company that is a -or HIG has a portfolio company that is a competitor of the
debtor.

And, I -- I guess it was about a year to a year and a half ago -- it was about a year and a half ago that debtors went through a process and hired an investment banker and went out to the market and talked with a lot of people about a transaction. And, one of the folks they talked with was HIG. And, HIG did due diligence, there were discussions, and no deal was reached.

So, in answer to your question, I believe a confidentiality agreement was signed. Personally I have not seen it. I don't know if it's still in effect. It was with the debtor and not the debtor-in-possession, so I think a new -- on that basis alone, a new confidentiality would have to be signed. But, there were discussions, there were negotiations. The parties know each other. And, that didn't result in a transaction.

Just to complete that thought, the debtor, before filing, reached out again to HIG. And, HIG indicated they weren't interested in that time in going forward with a transaction. This was back in mid January. That was through Mr. Grabell.

So, to sort of back track and -- and give Your Honor sort of our view on the HIG document request, they've --

Felger - Argument

they've asked for -- and, admittedly, it's a -- it's a rather limited list. I've seen due diligence lists that are entirely too burdensome and certainly more burdensome than the request made by HIG. But, what they've done is they've broken it into two pieces. They've asked for documents relative to the alternative DIP financing, and they've asked for documents relative to the alternative plan.

The discussions we had yesterday went to providing them with the documents relative to the DIP financing. And, -- and, I think where the Committee came out on the plan documents was -- I think Mr. Sirota used the word place holder -- let's deal with that after we provide the first wave of documents on the DIP financing. So, those are the documents they're looking for.

What we've done is we've -- you know, first and foremost, Your Honor heard it at the first day, how we got to where we were on March 16th. It was a very difficult, very intensive two-month process where we had a lender group that was squeezing us hard and indicating to us that they weren't prepared to do any lengthy process because a lengthy process would -- would involve almost tripling where the company was in their over advance. And, they did not have an appetite to do that.

The company had discussions with a lot of folks, and they -- including they reached out to HIG at that point. And,

Felger - Argument

quite frankly, the only party that stepped up with expressing an interest in doing something quickly, which is what the debtor had -- had to accomplish, was Versa. They stepped up, they had a battalion of people at the company's operations for two weeks, invested thousands of hours -- of man hours of time, and put a proposal on the table very quickly.

That proposal was enough to get our lenders to agree to continue to talk with Versa, which they did, and we did.

And, we continued to work hard to get to a point where there would be an acceptable arrangement among the debtors, the lender group, and Versa.

And, -- so, where we found ourselves on the 16th was a situation where we weren't pulling the plug and sending a thousand people home. We were keeping a business alive. We had -- we had DIP financing in place from our existing lender group and Versa. We had exit facilities committed to from both groups.

We had a plan committed to that provided for payment of secured debt, payment of the freight of the case, payment of all the priority claims, a small dividend to unsecured creditors -- and, admittedly, I asked for more, and the response was that's the Committee's job. So, there was a recognition there would be a negotiation with the Committee to make that a better deal for the unsecured creditors.

In addition, we were saving a thousand jobs, keeping

a business that's been in the community for 50 years alive, and we're keeping a customer for the unsecured creditors. And, I have to tell you, I represent a lot of committees. And, future profits sometimes is more important than dividend. So, we were -- we thought keeping a customer alive, saving a thousand jobs is very important.

So, we agreed to go forward with that. We agreed to support their debtor-in-possession financing. We agreed to support their plan -- the debtors and the owners agreed to support their deal. So, that's where we were on the 16th.

We now have HIG coming back into the fold. And, God bless them, they've been very vigilant. Mr. Brody has been very diligent, very responsive. And, they started with a DIP financing agreement. They then added an asset purchase agreement to that. The Committee expressed a lot of concerns with the asset purchase agreement, as we had concerns with an asset purchase agreement. And, they've changed it now to a plan. So, they -- they're now out there with a -- an alternative DIP financing arrangement and an alternative plan.

A couple of nights ago I reached out to Mr. Halperin, and I raised a number of concerns in an e-mail. And, I think they are valid concerns for any fiduciary in considering providing these documents to HIG and perhaps switching horses at this point. And, that's why I wanted a chambers conference, because these are valid concerns, Your Honor should know about

Felger - Argument

these concerns, and I'm not entirely comfortable vetting them at this point, because a couple of them go to information that isn't public at this point.

I have my e-mail to Mr. Halperin, and I'm happy to share it with Your Honor because it expresses the debtor's concerns with respect to where the HIG folks are at this point. If I could approach and hand it up?

THE COURT: All right. Well, why don't we just hold for -- that for a minute, because we'll see where we're going to go, whether we're going to have a chambers conference, what we're going to do here, hear what everybody has to say, and then we'll decide how we're going to go from there.

MR. FELGER: Okay. So, --

THE COURT: But, I -- but, I --

MR. FELGER: -- the backdrop --

THE COURT: -- recognize you're telling me you had confidentiality concerns.

MR. FELGER: So, the backdrop is we worked hard, and Versa worked very hard. And, they stepped up when no one else stepped up. And, we agreed as part of that deal to support them, and we're bound to support them through the papers. We have issues with where HIG is at this point, not only on their papers and the items expressed in my e-mail. They're a strategic buyer, they are a competitor of ours, and it's always dangerous giving confidential proprietary information in this

setting to a -- a competitor.

My third point on providing documents to HIG is process. We don't have a process approved by Your Honor to provide information to anyone. And, what does it mean when I give documents to HIG? Does that then mean that, when another competitor shows up tomorrow, we need to do the same thing?

So, process is an issue for us. And, procedurally, you know, where are we? We don't have a motion to compel documents from HIG. So, procedurally, before we -- I hate this expression -- but, willy-nilly give somebody documents, we need to know where that ends, where it begins. So, I wanted to give Your Honor that backdrop before you hear from the Committee and before you hear from Versa.

Again, I'm going to -- you know, I'm going to finish where I started and say that the debtor is in a -- in a difficult spot based upon what we're hearing from both sides, and certainly we hope to get some guidance from Your Honor today.

THE COURT: All right. With regard to the last one thing you brought up, the procedural thing, I'm not as concerned about that because of the very expedited situation that we're in. I mean, you know, we'll address it. But, if it can be taken care of in an expeditious manner, I'm not going to have form over substance and worry about getting a motion in when everybody, I think, agrees that this has to be quick --

done quickly.

And, that's one of the issues that I probably will want to hear from you, once we hear everything else, as to what's going on with the debtor between the -- we had our first hearing today and going forward.

MR. FELGER: That's one of the issues I didn't want to -- that on the record. But, --

THE COURT: Right. I'm saying that that -- that's a concern that I -- you know, I see under -- I mean, we spent a long time the first day. And, I recognize that the Committee wasn't here, the U.S. Trustee brought up a few things. But, neither of us really knew everything that was -- that had happened over the last months and weeks, but got a sense of it from the testimony that was given.

And, I did make the rulings that I did based on what I said -- I mean, on -- basically on two reasons. One, that this was basically the only game in town at the time and the debtor would close that day if not for the financing. And, that's -- that was the bottom line that led to the interim order that was entered.

And, fully recognizing that the Committee was going to come into the case and we were going to -- and, I expected and -- I expect and I did expect that it would be a negotiation, and we would hear from all of the other issues -- hear all the other issues, and we would go from there. And, I

Halperin - Argument

-- just to say that I did have a very short time to review Mr. Shapiro's late filed response.

And, if I can summarize the essence of it, it was -it kind of focused on, you know, the debtor's rights as having
exclusivity to file a plan and use its business judgment. And,
I'm very sensitive to that, and I think that is true. But, on
the other hand, this is not just an in the market business
transaction. You want the Court's approval. The Court has to
be satisfied that it is appropriate to approve it and hear from
everybody else.

And, I don't think you're saying that we shouldn't hear from everybody else, Mr. Shapiro. But, there's a lot more to it than just the debtor's business judgment. And, I think, bottom line, if we -- if you don't resolve some of these issues when you're coming into court, that's what you're going to have to satisfy the Court that it was a good business judgment and it continues to be a good business judgment, notwithstanding whatever else is out there. So, with that in mind, Mr. Halperin?

MR. HALPERIN: Thank you, Your Honor. Alan Halperin, Halperin, Battaglia, Raicht, on behalf of the Committee. As we indicated earlier, Your Honor, I'm joined by Michael Sirota, my co-counsel of Cole Schotz. I'd like to initially address the adjournment request to Your Honor. And, then I'd ask Mr. Sirota to talk about certain aspects of the document turnover

Halperin - Argument

to HIG and scheduling issues, as he's going to be primarily responsible for trial work.

THE COURT: Can we just back up one -- the orders for your appointment haven't been entered yet because they're waiting the 20-day period. But, I wanted to have a sense of how -- why the Committee needs two -- two counsel and how you're dividing up the services, if you wouldn't mind.

MR. HALPERIN: Absolutely, Your Honor. First and foremost, there is a rule in New Jersey, as you're better familiar than I am, that we are required to have a local counsel. And, in addition, we had certain limited conflicts, one of which could be very significant with respect to CIT. So, in addition to needing local counsel, we were going to need a conflicts counsel.

And, we've worked with Cole Schotz in the past. We have a good rapport with them. I've had cases specifically with Michael and his partner Ilana in the past. And, it was a good working relationship, and so it made perfect sense. It was a good overlay and a good fit for the two of us. They didn't have conflict with people that we did, we didn't have conflicts with people that they did.

In addition, there are -- there's no -- there's no ego involved here, so to speak. So, to the extent there are certain individual issues or things, we're happy to say to them, to the extent they have time or manpower to do it, here,

Halperin - Argument

take this and deal with it. We're not enmeshed in the same things; we're not duplicating each other.

The only time that there is some duplication, I suppose, is now, because you've got so many big ticket items that are enmeshed with each other. If we had just had the disclosure statement standing discreetly and the financing standing discreetly, it would be very easy. I'm going to let you deal with the financing, we'll deal with the disclosure statement.

It would be just -- but, he can't. It's all intertwined and meshed. So, there's a little bit of an overlap right now. But, we envision, as we always did at the beginning, when we go forward, that there will be no overlap and no duplication. And, we recognize that our fee applications are going to be submitted to scrutiny on that point.

And, we have discussed this with the U.S. Trustee who has indicated he has some comfort on that because, in fact, there is a good fit. We do fit together well with respect to this case and the conflict issues. Okay.

Given the flurry of filings, the supplemental amendments that -- to the disclosure statement that were filed within the last -- I think it was less than 48 hours ago -- we recognize the common sense appeal of an adjournment of the DIP and the disclosure statement. The problem that the Committee

has is that we have a broken process here.

And, we've made requests of the debtor in connection with the adjournment of a very limited list of things that we'd like to see happen in order to fix that process so that we would be able to move forward in terms of presenting our case to the extent we have to. But, even better, that we actually could maybe fix the process a little bit and not have a fight and move forward consentually.

As Mr. Felger represented -- and he represented accurately -- most of the issues were addressed. But, the two, I would say, most fundamental to fixing what we perceive as a broken process remain open. And, that is getting information immediately to Arch Acquisition, the HIG subsidiary, so that it can conduct the due diligence that it needs to be able to finish up and conclude that, yes, we're prepared to provide a replacement DIP.

I would roll the disclosure statement into that.

But, in order to make it in bite size chunks and make it a little easier, because the debtor did express some concerns, we did say break it out, bifurcate it, and we'll deal with the second tranche later.

And, the second was more procedural. And, Your Honor kind of addressed that just a few moments ago, that, at the adjourned hearing, if a suitable replacement DIP term loan lender were available, that we would be able to at least

Halperin - Argument

present it to the Court and that we wouldn't be facing any procedural gamesmanship, because time is short. We don't have a lot here.

I -- I like to think I'm not prone to hyperbole, and I don't think I'm giving you any here. But, this is perhaps the most egregious plan I've seen in practice. It's very complicated, it's very thick, there's a lot of paperwork, and the plan and the DIP are tied together. And, they're choreographed to basically deliver a business to a buyer on a private deal that was negotiated before the bankruptcy when there were no creditors and anybody else involved in the process to sort of keep an eye out for what was maybe in their best interest.

The process provides control to Versa. They hold a 79.9 percent equity vote of the parent debtor. And, it has very restrictive DIP loan terms that are designed to protect that plan to prevent anybody from coming in and maybe presenting some sort of competition to get the assets. From our perspective, as a result, we have a debtor that's refusing an open process and won't provide information to parties that are interested in making competing offers or, alternatively, and specifically with respect to the HIG subsidiary, a competing DIP loan on much better terms.

There are several parties that have reached out to the Committee, we believe the debtor as well, and, in fact,

Halperin - Argument

even to the Court, pleadings that have been filed, to express their interest and their frustration with the process. As we noted in particular, Arch Acquisition, which is a subsidiary of HIG, has committed substantial resources to get themselves up to speed, to prepare an alternative DIP loan, to prepare an alternative plan, first an asset aqui -- an APA, and then we said, no, that doesn't really work.

It's really got to be apples to apples, and we don't want to see something fall through the cracks. We need to see -- if you really want to do this, show us, prepare a plan. And, they committed the resources to do all of this in face of the fact that all of these documents were out there, and there was a lock up for Versa. Yet, they still committed the resources, and they're still here. And, they're still filing papers with the Court, and they're represented today.

They have indicated that they have due diligence requests. As Mr. Felger accurately represented, it's a very limited due diligence request with respect to the DIP loan and, again, short with respect to their plan process, although it is somewhat longer. And, despite repeated requests from both HIG and from the Committee, -- and, you know, Mr. Felger acknowledged that I have been harping with him of this -- the debtors and Versa have re -- provided HIG with nothing, and they have refused to provide HIG documents.

From our perspective, the debtor has a fiduciary

obligation to its creditors and to the estate, and it's consistent with bankruptcy law, to seek the highest and best value for the businesses and the assets. Yet, the debtors and Versa, who control the debtors, take the position that even providing due diligence to HIG would be effectively a default under the DIP loan. There's nothing in the DIP loan that says that.

But, to the extent HIG says, listen, we're not doing this because we're a lending institution, we're prepared to substitute in for them because we want to make a run of these assets, that would bring it within the realm of a default -- and, -- default -- I'm sorry -- under the DIP loan and the interim order.

So, two days after the case files, they're before Your Honor. Quite frankly, from my perspective, they're presenting you with a very difficult task because I saw the volume of papers that were filed. There's, like, no notice. And, that is a mound of papers to go through. You know, we didn't get through it in two days. That's why we had requested adjournment initially and said we need time, we've got to get our arms around this. We're not even sure exactly what you're proposing or asking for.

But, in two days, Your Honor is presented with uncontested testimony and a record that says this is what we gotta do, only game in town, we're gonna shut down. There's no

Halperin - Argument

creditors there to provide any counter -- counter balance.

There's no -- virtually no notice. It's two days after, and it's very difficult for people to come in.

And, so, the order is entered. And, now they're using that order effectively as a weapon to hijack the process. Effectively what we're going told is, you know, someone is going to compete with us on this plan, we're not giving them due diligence and you shouldn't, because that's a default and we just may pull the plug and not fund. That's pretty outrageous from the Committee's perspective.

The Arcus DIP loan is replete with overbearing and egregious provisions that are designed to defend the transfer of the business to Arcus without any competition. I mean, for example, the EBITDA and other covenants that were in the document -- most -- many of them -- some of them -- let me not over -- overstate. Some of them were in default virtually from inception which provides Arcus a position of leverage further; I'll waive or, if I get concerned, I won't waive. And, then I've got greater leverage over the process.

There's a deadline of May 30th for confirmation of the Arcus plan, -- not a plan that pays them out, but the Arcus plan and substantial confirmation of the Arcus plan by June 30th, the failure of which are more defaults. There's no time for a proper process in this bankruptcy.

Even though they're arguing that they can't -- that

Halperin - Argument

no one can shop and no one can provide an alternative DIP, there's a right of first refusal in the DIP that, if someone else comes up, that they have a right to -- to match that.

And, again, as I noted earlier, there would be a breach of effectively a no shop provision if you start providing information to these entities.

The debtors released Arcus and its affiliates and its principals upon entry of the interim order of everything, which would include if there were any breaches of fiduciary duty and the like -- just remember they are in a position of control -- arising before the date of interim order, whether it related to the DIP or not. It's very broad. I think that's in Section 4.5.

They're trying to exclude the Committee monetarily from the process, so the Committee will not be able to put up an argument, because in the budget they put line items that are so draconianly small -- in fact they're dwarfed by the payment of fees for the two DIP lenders which are, between the two of them, total almost \$1M under the loan. And, so that, if the debtor were even to pay those fees, that would be another default under the DIP loan. You can't pay them. They're trying to lock it up that way.

And, that's on top of the liens on avoidance actions, the 506C waiver, coupled with the vesting of actions, whether avoidance actions or fiduciary duty actions, or anything else,

Halperin - Argument

back in the reorganized debtor under the plan. And, under the plan, it goes to Arcus, so those never see the light of day if there are any issues.

From our perspective, the fundamental principles that underlie Chapter 11 mandate a fair and open process. Maximize value for unsecured creditors. From our perspective, management and ownership has fiduciary duties to the creditors. But, the process they've set up tramples all over those duties, it just does. The process is broken, and we think it needs to be fixed here and now.

What we want to see is the process opened up so that other people can come in and kick the tires. With respect to who gets what information, I'm going to -- I'm going to Mr. Sirota on that because he's going to be dealing with it. But, I would say this. I do think it rings a little hollow to say, well, you know, who did we give information to.

I think there's a vast difference between someone that has stepped up, put in the hours to put in replacement documents -- it's not like you're just jotting down a note. I mean, this is a replacement plan or a replacement DIP loan. There's a difference between someone like that and someone who sends a note, hey, I'd like to see your information.

And, as I've also told them repeatedly, we can address those issues. We can address who gets what information, when. We'd like to engage in discussions to set

Halperin - Argument

that up. But, there is no discussion to set that up. All we keep hearing is why it can't be done, and we have a problem with that.

THE COURT: Let me just ask you the one question as far as the confidentiality information that was in Mr. Felger's e-mail to you. How do you respond to that as far as concern -- I mean, it has to be a concern of the Committee. I mean, you are talking with competitors and -- how -- how do you propose that that is addressed -- that issue can be addressed?

MR. HALPERIN: There are a couple of things. And, these are just off the top of my head, Your Honor. First, I think that also rings a little hollow because, as Mr. Felger indicated, they had some sort of a process. And, we take issue whether it was anything like what they're dealing with now.

It's very different when you're a year and a half ago and you're talking about a different spectrum of dollars that you're looking for a business than what you're looking for in a bankruptcy, especially when it's compared to the Versa plan.

But, that --

THE COURT: If you're going to -- the debtor's position that, you know, they weren't there and they're here now kind of thing -- I'm not getting into that.

MR. HALPERIN: Okay.

THE COURT: I'm just -- I'm just talking about basically -- I'm hearing what you're saying --

Halperin - Argument

MR. HALPERIN: The confidentiality issues.

THE COURT: -- about the -- about the debtor's responsibility and fiduciary --

MR. HALPERIN: Yes.

THE COURT: -- duty. I want to know --

MR. HALPERIN: How you --

THE COURT: -- how you -- if you think that -- or how you think you can protect the debtor's information so that we can have this full and fair hearing.

MR. HALPERIN: Okay. And, there are two points to that. The first one -- and I apologize if I wasn't clear in getting to it. But, I think the complaint itself rings a little hollow because they indicated they've already done this, and they've already signed confidentiality agreements, and they've already provided information to other people to do this.

So, I don't know why all of a sudden now, when it was okay back then, now it's not okay, because they're competitors. They were competitors back then too, as was everybody else that was involved. If that confidentiality agreement doesn't work, then we sign a new one. If there are provisions that need to be corrected in it or fixed, absolutely, you deal with that.

We signed a confidentiality agreement, as did Arcus and, I believe, CIT. I was told they did. We actually worked off their form. So, I don't see why another one can't be

Halperin - Argument

done --

THE COURT: Was there anything --

MR. HALPERIN: -- for somebody else.

THE COURT: -- in Mr. Felger's e-mail to you that you felt couldn't be addressed by confidentiality agreement, without being specific. I know he --

MR. HALPERIN: I pers --

THE COURT: -- doesn't want to get specific on the record, but --

MR. HALPERIN: I personally don't, whether it's confidentiality agreement or perhaps tweaking of the information. I mean, for example, there may be certain discreet pieces of information that would make it very easy for a competitor to then, you know, target some of your customer base.

But, there's ways of doing blinds of stuff like that or putting intermediaries in to water things down or mask them so that certain information isn't provided. Those are things that can be addressed. And, I don't pretend to have all the answers sitting here.

But, the point is we're in a bankruptcy. This is not a private transaction. This is not a -- you know, oh, my goodness, we shouldn't allow the competitor to come in. Your Honor, you know better than I do that constantly there are asset sales in bankruptcy. And, who are the most likely

Halperin / Felger - Argument

suitors that bid on these things? Strategics, because it's worth the most to them or it can be worth the most to them.

And, so, while I agree there are issues -- and, I said to Mr. Felger at least once or twice, you know, certain of the specifics that you've raised, lets try and address them.

I'm not saying they're illegitimate concerns. But, you can't shut people out. We need an open process. I'd like to hand it over to Mr. Sirota, if I may.

MR. FELGER: Can I just interject one comment on my e-mail. The confidentiality was just one small piece of my e-mail. There were a number of concerns raised. For instance, an alternative DIP to take out Arcus is 25 of the 85. Do they have someone to step in and do the other 60 because I don't know, standing here today, whether CIT will do that. That I can say on the record.

THE COURT: But, --

MR. FELGER: But, that's one of the concerns I raised.

THE COURT: But, what I'm -- but, that really goes to you've got to give the information so you see if they're going to step up. I mean, --

MR. FELGER: Well, -- but, also --

THE COURT: -- truthfully, Mr. Felger, I -- you know,
I do -- I know that your client was in -- was in and still is
in a very difficult position. And, I'm not unmindful of the

Felger - Argument

fact that Arcus stepped up, and they were there, and it was a difficult situation. So, I'm not drawing any conclusions or making any determinations. I'm not getting into good faith and bad faith that everybody threw around in the papers that I've seen.

But, -- because, if that's still an issue, I'll be hearing that when we get to the fin -- whether it's today or some other day -- the final approval for the financing and the final approval for a plan. All those issues will come out unless they all et resolved.

MR. FELGER: Right.

THE COURT: But, -- so, for today's purposes, considering the everybody was trying to go forward in good faith, --

MR. FELGER: Right.

THE COURT: -- that still doesn't mean that other parties to the case don't have a right to know what's going on because we're -- we're doing everything on a very expedited basis, which I'm making the assumption is still necessary because of whatever I -- what I heard at the least hearing -- and, I haven't heard anything differently -- that you have to at least give enough information to the Committee and the parties that want to proceed this for you then to come back and say, well, notwithstanding that, this is still the best offer because -- and -- which you may do, you may not do.

Felger - Argument

I -- you know, I know you've got responsibilities under the agreement and it ties up the debtor at certain times. And, that was a lot of the reason that the U.S. Trustee requested and the Court approved certain things in -- that were not finalized in the original financing which tied the debtor up, but still left the Committee with that responsibility to look into the -- the liens, to look into whether there are causes of action, to address the avoidance action position, and all of the other things that, by intention, were left open for the Committee to have a chance to do -- they have to be able to do their job.

MR. FELGER: Right. No, I -- I simply -- simply to clarify if I misspoke about my e-mail, it wasn't only limited to --

THE COURT: Well, --

MR. FELGER: -- confidentiality issues.

THE COURT: But, -- and, if it was -- and, if it went in detail to whether -- whether this will work or not -- I mean, time will tell. And, it's going to be a short time. So, I don't believe, from what I've heard, that the debtor can go for a long time and still make any of this work.

So, that being -- that being said, I'm concerned about -- I am concerned about confidentiality. To the extent that this doesn't end up being the best deal, I don't want there to be a problem with the deal that exists now or the

Sirota - Argument

continuing operation of whatever ends up being the reorganized debtor when we get there.

And, I don't think the Committee wants that either, because I have to assume that their constituency wants a reorganized debtor that's still going to do business with them, and so on. So, I think that everybody wants that same result.

And, I'm trying to find if there's a way that we can get there.

MR. FELGER: Right.

MR. SIROTA: Judge, good morning, --

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. SIROTA: -- if the Court please. What's so obvious -- what is so obvious to this Court apparently is not so obvious to this debtor that is in a very difficult predicament. But, unlike the difficult spot that Mr. Felger addressed twice, we're not in a difficult spot.

We have not taken this case and assigned our fiduciary duty to a buyer or anyone else. The fact that Mr. Felger has to go to Mr. Shapiro and ask him whether or not documents can be produced that would run a spirited process, from our perspective, is where all of this drama lies.

And, that is, how are we ever going to get to the core issue of whether there are higher or better offers under this very hideous process that's been presented to the Court?

If I were to come to Your Honor with a closely held company and individuals and present the first day an application that said

Sirota - Argument

my clients are going to be the DIP lender, they're going to be the buyer and the debtor-in-possession, I would expect to be driving back to Hackensack, New Jersey with a Trustee appointed.

Now, this process is equally hideous. And, in fact, it's more hideous because it has the debtor locked up so many different ways that poor Mr. Felger can't even, without worrying about Versa threatening law suits and other things, get us some basic information. We were dead set against this adjournment today because, frankly, we thought adjourning it to another day would be a complete waste of time.

Any adjournment of a process that freezes out the market in a bankruptcy proceeding, to us, is simply so antithetical to the Bankruptcy Code that it didn't deserve to be kicked off a week or a day. But, Mr. Felger came back and addressed most of our concerns, leaving the most important one open for debate today.

And, so, Judge, I think that it's fundamental -whether it's a protective order, the Court does it all day
long, the parties do it all day long -- that we get to HIG what
they need to tell us whether it's a \$25M deal, \$85M deal,
whether CIT is in or out.

But, those requests and those discussions should not go through Versa who's sitting there pre -- telling us that their answer to everything is, don't worry, we're going to file

Sirota - Argument

an amended plan and disclosure statement, pat your Committee on the head, throw them another nickel, and everything is going to be fine because the debtor's business judgment is going to control. We should address today head on that that is a dead end road because a lot of money is going to be spent.

Your Honor asked about the Committee representation and duplication. We are investing a fortune in addressing a defective process when, if the process were open, we could all be on our way to what's done in this court every day, invite HIG or whoever else is out there to participate. Versa is more than welcome to put more money into this equation and move on.

This is not a simple negotiation over a dividend, a 506C waiver. No one on this side of the table is selling out a client because they're going to expand the carve out. We could care less. The process needs to be open. This is the first phase.

I will suggest, Judge, that even in giving HIG the documents is not going to avoid the traffic accident on the return date. We have spent time preparing for today, several witnesses, both cross-examination of the witnesses they produced to you on the first day, as well as other witnesses to talk about this hideous process.

And, I respectfully suggest to this Court Your Honor will not be happy with the representations made upon which you relied in entering in these interim orders. And, we plan to

Sirota - Argument

establish to this Court that Your Honor was given, at best, a very, very incomplete story. And, I'm not going to burden the Court or the record with some of that, at best, incompleteness. But, it's critical that this process be open.

And, Judge, I'm not aware of any statutory provision that says, if you hit a certain level of employees, the rest of the provisions of the Bankruptcy Code go out the window. We're very sensitive to the future of this business. We're very sensitive to the fact that there are a thousand employees. But, that shouldn't be an excuse for Versa to steal this company under the cover of night with no open and notorious process.

The Committee is not going to sell out its fiduciary duties for the prospect that some people do business with this debtor in the future. They've been guided very carefully.

And, they understand that the objective is to maximize value.

And, they hear from their lawyers loud and clear that the process presented at this point is exactly contrary to what should be happening.

I heard Mr. Felger say he's bound to support Versa. Very troublesome. He's bound to support the Code and a process, not blindly support Versa. And, if it's a problem, then I think, at the next hearing, we should talk about who may be free from that binding of Versa and move forward in a much more even keeled fashion.

not more money, more money in an open process.

Sirota - Argument

So, very simply, Judge, we think the documents should be produced. If we can't agree, as professionals doing this every day, on a protective order to get those documents produced today, then we should stay here and be guided by Your Honor under what conditions they should be produced. It should be open. And, then we'll be back here suggesting to the Court hopefully that we have a competitor, somebody who stepped up already prepared to offer more money, but more importantly --

HIG has said whatever we give to the Committee, that's the base line. Versa comes in, HIG comes in, and we're off to the races. We can't have this locked up, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this one question.

Assuming that I order that -- or you work out an arrangement, one or the other -- to get these other documents, which were the four and five of the list that Mr. Felger presented, do you think that an adjournment would be valuable?

MR. SIROTA: I do, Judge, because it would allow HIG to quickly analyze the situation. And, then we would be back here, assuming things go well, taking out Versa, putting HIG in the DIP seat. I understand the CIT complexity. I would like to hear CIT say we'll do a deal with Versa, but not with HIG. I don't believe that will happen.

And, if it does happen, HIG will have to evaluate

Brody - Argument

whether they have to write a check for \$85M. And, then we would dispute some of the fees, and tricked up and boobytrapped DIP things that are in there with respect to termination fees and the rest of it.

THE COURT: Mr. Brody?

MR. BRODY: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

MR. BRODY: Your Honor, at the outset, I'm just confused. I was always taught that the fiduciary duty of a debtor is to maximize the value of the estate. You've heard that from both counsel from the Committee who were very hard to follow because they laid it out.

Your Honor, HIG came in at the beginning of this case and provided the debtor and the Creditors Committee with a commitment letter to loan the debtor money, \$25M, the same loan that Arcus was going to have -- to take Arcus out, but on better terms and, what was most important to us, to open up the process to a competitive bidding, whether it be through a sale under Section 363 or plan -- an open bidding process.

And, we were willing to lend the money as long as there was an open process. If, at the end of the process, we won, that's fine. If Arcus won or somebody else won, all it does it maximize value.

We sent that in, and we didn't hear much from the

debtor. We immediately followed up in days with a full asset purchase agreement -- a full asset purchase agreement, not just a term sheet. We wanted to show how committed HIG is. And, the full asset purchase agreement had a purchase price of approximately \$83M plus the assumption of various liabilities.

I personally took the plan that they had and tried to make it was comparable with the claims that was set forth in the disclosure statement and the schedules. And, part of that 83 million was a fully pay off or Arcus' DIP and a full pay off of CIT. So, the question of would HIG come here with 85 million -- we've already said that we would.

We didn't hear from the debtor. We heard from the Committee. The Committee asked us we really want to makes this apples to apples. Can you do it as a plan? We want to make sure that nothing falls through the cracks with respect to payment of claims because, from the Committee's perspective, they wanted to make sure that all the claims were paid.

And, by the way, as a side note, Your Honor, among the other differences in our proposal, in addition to paying two DIP lenders, was to provide a pot of money for unsecured creditors of \$5M -- not 500,000 that the debtor is proposing with a two percent distribution, but 5 million.

And, Your Honor, I do -- I do -- absolutely do take to heart what debtor's counsel had said, that the future profit is more important than dividends. Your Honor, I think that's

7 .

Brody - Argument

flipping the cart around somehow because the future profit goes to the owner which, in this case, is Versa slash Arcus.

But, we were asked to do it as a plan. Your Honor, we committed the resources. We committed the resources, we took the Arcus plan, and we put -- we changed it so that it would -- they could compare the apples to apples, it would create the pot of 5 million, it would do what was being done under Arcus, but better.

It allowed for additional payments, for example, to the real estate secured cred -- the real estate taxes, which is represented here by Mr. Klein, and he filed an objection. It allowed for all the other payments. And, Your Honor, we had discussions with the Committee. And, we said, what we want, again, is to have an open process.

If this plan is not the most value to this estate, let Arcus or anybody else come forward with more. Whatever process -- we want to talk process as to how to make this an open competitive bidding. Again, we'll lend the money so he debtor can survive through either a sale or plan process.

If, at the end of the day, we're not the highest and best off, so be it. That's fine. But, right now, we are, and we want to have this process. Again, we didn't hear anything from the debtor.

We were asked to submit our due diligence list with respect to both the plan and the DIP. And, we provided what I

Brody - Argument

think is a short list of documents, documents that should be available to any purchaser. We got no response from the debtor. There's a theme here, Your Honor. And, I apologize I have to say it, but that's what's going on.

The Committee came back and said, can you pare down the list for what you need to fund? If we go forward today on a DIP, what do you need to fund? Your Honor, we gave them five items. Five items. Five items.

One, we'd like to talk to CIT. We'd like permission to talk to CIT. They haven't responded. We want to make sure that CIT just doesn't go above their \$60M availability, which I don't believe they can under your order anyway. But, we want to talk to them.

Two is we want a competitive process. Three is we'd like confirmation that the assets actually exist. And, what we asked for -- and we actually said in my e-mail to Mr. Felger -- is the easiest thing is give us a borrowing base certificate. That would do it.

We want a revised budget because we'd like to see the actual -- what actually occurred, something they should be putting in to this court anyway. And, we want an order at the end of the day, if we are the DIP lender, that gives us the rights as a DIP lender. That's our list. We never heard from the debtor.

Today you hear confidentiality. Your Honor, it's the

Brody - Argument

first I'm hearing from Mr. Felger that there's any issue of confidentiality. HIG signed a confidentiality agreement on July 12th, 2007. It's a three-year confidentiality agreement. So, even if there is any confidentiality issue, we're bound by a confidentiality agreement.

The debtor says, well, we're not a debtor-inpossession, so maybe this confidentiality agreement doesn't
stand. They never asked us for a new one. We'll sign a new
one. That's fine. It's not an issue. Certainly the documents
we're asking for are not so egregious. Even if we are a
competitor, we haven't asked for customer lists. We haven't
asked for anything that a competitor could somehow twist and
use against them. Your Honor, we've shown our commitment.

To add to this, Your Honor, the Committee asked us -we have your letter of commit -- we have your letter of
commitment with respect to the DIP. We have your APA which
converted to a plan. All these have been provided to the
debtors as well. Can you give us other documents with respect
to the DIP? No problem.

We provided the debtor and the Committees with a full DIP agreement and a full proposed DIP final order. We're real, we're ready. We're committed, we have the funds. They won't turn over the smallest documents that should be turned over to anybody that walked into this Court in a bankruptcy process.

They are tied to Arcus. They claim they're bound.

D'Auria - Argument

And, therefore, they've breached any duty that they have to maximize the value of this estate. And, as Mr. Sirota correctly stated, perhaps at the return date of the next hearing, we determine who is not bound and who truly can comply with the duties of a debtor -- a debtor-in-possession under the Bankruptcy Code to maximize the value. A competitive process is the only way, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. D'Auria?

MR. D'AURIA: Thank you, Your Honor. I'd like to make three quick points, if I could, Judge. Thank you. A thousand employees, Your Honor. If we can get past the hurdle that is being debated involving getting due diligence information to HIG and an adjournment keeps the case alive, and a thousand employees have somewhere to go to work tomorrow, I have no objection to an adjournment.

But, secondly, getting the documents to HIG. We respectfully assert that must happen. But, more than that, the next step is any document given to HIG for the purpose of doing due diligence, whether it's in the guise of doing a competing DIP or in the guise of doing a competing plan slash sale -- any such information has to be put in some sort of depository.

Whether it's a binder, a box of documents, or a room of documents, it's got to be preserved, because the concept that it should be available to the market is one that we are not going to forget to remember at a final hearing on the DIP

D'Auria / Shapiro - Argument

or a final hearing of confirmation. We respectfully assert that -- that any such information has to be preserved in some sort of third copy depository. And, the only reason why I mean third copy is I'm assuming HIG number one, Committee number two, or whatever, Your Honor.

And, my third and last point, Your Honor, is this whole conversation revolves around one point. Arcus is in control of the debtor and of this process. And, what I'll call Felger's dilemma -- Mr. Felger is a gentleman. But, his precarious position is the product of how this case entered into Chapter 11. But, it's in Chapter 11 now.

And, the developments from the first day hearing on March 18th through today have only fueled the concerns that I made at the very outset of that -- of that hearing. Without belaboring the points, I'll leave it at that. But, if we're going to get past the hurdle of HIG's documents, my number one point for today on that issue is that the documents should be preserved in some sort of depository so they're available to the market at some other time. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Shapiro?

MR. SHAPIRO: My apologies for giving the Committee a continuance last time, because apparently they're not interested in giving continuances this time. They're ready to go forward and beat me up and kill me, and that's fine. So, I won't make that mistake again. But, putting that aside, we are

here today --

.15

wouldn't have granted them -- granted you the adjournment or grant them the adjournment. I -- I noticed, I did see a lot of little language in there that this wouldn't agree to it.

But, I mean, the Court is going to make the final call on whether a case should be -- a matter should be adjourned or not. And if there's -- if either side doesn't have enough time to respond to something, that's going to be grounds for an adjournment.

MR. SHAPIRO: I appreciate that, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Assuming that the status of the case allows it.

MR. SHAPIRO: Agreed. Agreed. Status quo is maintained, at least to today. And, obviously, we're having a hearing on the continuance that's turning into something very different.

I -- I guess, Your Honor, everybody's concerned with the process, and I -- I guess I'm confused myself. Because every time I see a 363 sale -- and the case is going back when I had a full head of hair and a thin waist -- said, "We like plans because plans give people all the bells and whistles and the rights to beat me up, to depose me, to ask for more money, to prove feasibility, to prove it's fair and equitable. That's what this was designed for.

So we're not fighting over a process, we're fighting over which process. To come here and say that a person that makes a loan, that's providing for it, that has a debtor that is defaulting under an agreement, and then that's a bad thing that they're in there -- we are asking for this process.

They're asking for a different process. If the process is that 1121 doesn't exist anymore, that no debtor is allowed to go forward and try to convince Your Honor through that process with all the bells and whistles that the Committees have and that other parties in interest have, then I don't know what it means anymore.

We filed a plan the first day to do that, to start that process, and they're saying, no, we don't want that process. Well, then, tell me what it means. We're here, we provided the funding and certainty of completing that process. They're saying, open it, throw that out, and maybe -- maybe they'll convince CIT to come in and stay with them. Because doing 25 million without the 60 is not going to get you to a process. And, by the way, Versa, I want you to stay in and fund that -- whatever this new process is. We appreciate that concept. What I guess we're saying is, we bought the package before you and we're asking you to look at effectuating a process.

Now, there's a lot of fiduciary duty thrown about that Mr. Felger's client shouldn't have done what he did

before, and we did something nefarious. If I were to tell
Toyota Motor that I was going to let General Motors make a
lien on their assets while they're in a bankruptcy proceeding,
you're worried about Versa being in alleged control and
pulling a trigger. You want a competitor who can say today,
hmm, there's a great way to get rid of a competitor. I just
won't waive it, there's a default, the assets are liquidated,
and I didn't pay a thing to anybody to get rid of my
competitor.

Do you feel comfortable installing them as the person that's going to run the process? You think that's better than Arch being there? I hope not.

THE COURT: Mr. Shapiro?

MR. SHAPIRO: Yes.

embellishment, yes, you're right, the process is, the debtor has exclusive right to file a plan. But there is disclosure information that should be available to parties. Because the debtor still has to satisfy the Court that what's being proposed is in the best interest of the creditors. And if that is opposed by the Committee or other -- others, who we'll find out when we get to that point, if we get to that point --

MR. SHAPIRO: If we get to that point.

THE COURT: -- the debtor has to be able to come in and say, we've considered these other options, we see these

other options, but this is better because -- and -- and you may be right that, that is what will end up happening, and the Court may approve that. But I can't do that in a vacuum because there are other interested parties to the process.

And I'm not going to cast any dispersions on your client. At the time -- you know, without getting any -- any other evidence besides what I have before me, I'm not going to say there was bad faith or -- or unfair dealing.

Your client wants to make money and get a good deal for themselves, and the debtor was in a difficult position and they felt -- they feel this is the best. That's what was represented to me. Your client feels it was the best. CIT feels it was the best. But, now, once you get into the bankruptcy, you have other entities that have an interest in there. And, unfortunately, on day one or two, when you were all here before, we didn't have the opportunity to give all those parties a chance to have all their input, and for -- for very valid reasons, in -- in my estimation.

The US Trustee wasn't happy with everything that was in your proposal. The Court wasn't happy with everything that was in your proposal. But on that day, based on what the evidence was presented to the Court, that was what this Court saw as being in the best interest of -- of the case. And, end result, that may be what's happened.

I'm not going to be able to -- to prognosticate on

what's going to be the best long term. I hate to see 1,000 people out of work, and I don't think there's anybody in here who doesn't think that that's something that's important. I'd hope that your client feels the same way. But I -- I don't know -- I don't know, from what I've heard so far, who's going to be the better one to keep those people employed afterwards.

And -- and, you know, if we get to the point in the process where the debtor's proposing this plan and wants to go forward with it and -- and presents it, that's going to be something that the Court's going to want to hear. But, at this point, what's being asked is to provide information. And the debtor has an obligation to provide information.

MR. SHAPIRO: The debtor has an obligation to provide information to the Committee, which it is doing.

That's not what's being asked here. You're saying to a third party, other than the Committee, who exercises fiduciary duty --

THE COURT: But --

MR. SHAPIRO: -- who is a competitor to --

THE COURT: I understand that.

MR. SHAPIRO: -- to analyze a process -- a process which, unless I missed you say something, you haven't broken yet, or ask you to start a process, then that means breaking it today. So tell me what process you're doing.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not sure what process that you

think I'm breaking. What I'm saying is --

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. We have a plan and disclosure statement coming up. The Committee has asked for information, depositions, we're giving them that so they can defend against that. That's the process under 1121.

THE COURT: I understand that.

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay.

THE COURT: But how can the Committee, I guess, assert a position that this is not the -- that there's better offers out there? Because that is something that was represented by the debtor on day one, that there was -- this was it.

MS. SHAPIRO: Correct.

THE COURT: And this was the best thing for the debtor. It was the best for the -- it was best for everybody. That was what was asserted and it needed to be decided day one. And that's what the Court relied on.

The Committee's position now, from what they've heard, is that there are better opportunities out there that should be considered. And they wanted to pursue that, and they need the debtor's information to do that. I don't think anything that I've heard of that's been asked for is unusual, especially, in light of the fact that they provided information to this potential buyer. And I recognize that it's a competitor, but, unfortunately, that's what happens in

-- in the marketplace.

And your client -- you did what you felt was best for your client. They want the best opportunity to make their -- their investment work. In the broad spectrum, I don't have a problem with that. But I'm not going to -- not going to hamstring the Committee's ability to look at this and to assert a position at a hearing that we're going to probably be having very soon on the confirmation of the plan, just based on the limited time frames that are set up here,

MR. SHAPIRO: I guess --

THE COURT: -- to refute the debtor's position that this is in the best interest of the estate. That is basically what they're asking me to allow them to do. I think they're entitled to have their right to do that.

MR. SIROTA: Judge, can I -- can I just clarify one thing, please?

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Sirota.

MR. SIROTA: Mr. Shapiro is going to the ultimate the process and Your Honor addressed the confirmation process. The hearing that was on for today that will be adjourned has to do with whether or not this Court can make a finding, at lease initially, of good faith on the debt. And so the debtor has to come forward -- forget the ultimate confirmation. And what Mr. Shapiro's client is trying to do is hide the two

together to prevent them from replacing the DIP. It may be that the upshot is that we replace the DIP next week. And if his client wants to stay in as a plan participant, they can do that. But the DIP here, and in good faith, comes first.

THE COURT: I mean, we're also here on disclosure, and there were some issues about the viability of the plan, so they do kind of run together. But, yes, you're right. I mean, that is a separate issue in and of itself whether the final hearing on the financing should be approved.

MR. SHAPIRO: But the financing provides for the ultimate 1121 and 1129 finding. I appreciate that you're saying we're going to separate them, but you can't because we didn't come in here as just the DIP lender. We came in here with a process under exclusivity.

If -- if you -- I guess what I'm saying, Your Honor, is, so my client, if you're going to rule the way it appears you're going to rule -- I'm not sure what you're ruling. I shouldn't take where it's headed. Your mouth, my apologies. If -- if you're allowing something to happen between now and the final date hearing, then you have to say exactly with whom and what. And then we have to understand that --

THE COURT: I'm not sure what you're -- what you're suggesting that I'm allowing. I'm being asked to order that certain documentation be provided to the Committee in order to provide --

MR. SHAPIRO: No, but the --

THE COURT: -- and to provide to the --

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. Because it's clearly being provided to the Committee. Like, nobody say that we're sitting here saying if they don't have the documents to exercise their duty. They're getting everything that they want. That's not what's being asked. They're saying for you to go outside the Committee and outside their fiduciary to a competitor. That's what's being asked today.

THE COURT: But it's not being asked to be given to a --

MR. SHAPIRO: That's all --

THE COURT: -- competitor. It was asked to be given, I guess, to a competitive bidder, which is a -- which is different. I mean, if it was another lending institution, investment -- investment company, would you have -- take a different position, oh, that was okay because it's not a competitor? I don't think so.

I mean, I understand what your position is, but it's not really based on the fact they're a competitor. Your client made a deal they like, and they wanted to go forward. And, absent anything else I've heard, that's -- that's fine. If the debtor wants to pursue that, that's fine. But we're talking about a discovery process that really is inherent in the bankruptcy process. If -- if you want this Court to

approve to it, the debtor is going to have to satisfy me that this financing meets its requirements under the code and ultimately the plaintiffs.

And I know they are tied together, but there are separate requirements, and -- and a lot of it has to do with -- especially, with a lot of the -- I want to say -- describe it as tie-ups that are in this -- in your financing, which the debtors consented to. And we -- we specifically left open for the Committee and the US Trustee and the Court to review further. That's why we had interim and a final. Parties have a right to look at that and see if that is in the best interest.

I mean, quite frankly, when we were here on the first day, I wouldn't have been -- I mean, I expected the Committee to have issues with certain things, but I -- there may -- I fully expected there may not have been anybody else stepping up and we'd be here today just on some of the issues about compensation and distribution and dividend and those things and that was the only thing.

But that's not what has happened in the -- in these last two weeks. And I think the Committee is entitled to explore the position they want to take with regard to approval of the financing and ultimately the plaintiff. And it's not lost on the Court that in this case and in many cases in -- especially in our market today, that the debtor -- I mean, I

MR. SHAPIRO: I'm prepared to deal with it.

what I'm concerned about is that I have exclusivity, nobody has filed a motion to terminate it yet. And now you've started -- I'm -- I'm just trying to understand what was --

THE COURT: I'm not -- I'm not -- I'm not saying that they can file a plan or I'm going to consider a plan. I am looking now at providing the -- for the debtor providing me information that they believe that Mr. Felger believes would violate some of the debtor's requirements to your client, provide information that is necessary for the Committee to make their determination. I realize that information is going to go to a third party who --

MR. SHAPIRO: That's what I'm --

THE COURT: -- is either they're bound --

MR. SHAPIRO: -- I want to understand. Who the --

THE COURT: -- by a confidentiality agreement or will be bound by a confidentiality agreement, which I'm very confident that counsel that is before me is completely prepared --

MR. SHAPIRO: Capable of doing that, if that's what Your Honor is instructing?

THE COURT: Yes, without any question. I have no question that that -- that can be accomplished. And that is something that is important to the Committee for it to be able to do its job, and I think it's appropriate to allow it.

That doesn't mean that Mr. Felger can't argue that

THE COURT: Right. Right. But, you know, if you

think there's something in there -- that list that was asked for today that -- that jeopardizes the -- the integrity of your client's interest or of the debtor's interest, Mr. Felger's concern, put some -- some restrictions on with required to it. I'm more than willing to have a telephone conference. We can go over anything we want, as long as it's before I'm not here. But --

MR. SHAPIRO: Well, we would.

THE COURT: And even then, you know, if you really need me, I will be available and I can be available by telephone conference, if you really need me at that time.

MR. SHAPIRO: I --

THE COURT: What I'm saying is, it's incumbent upon the debtor and, I think, to the debtor's advantage to provide as much as possible. Because when we come back here, if it's still disputed, I'm going to be looking at that. And if the other side says, well, Judge, if we had this, it would -- you know, it might be different. I want to know what the difference is. And then Mr. Felger is in a better position to say why this is a better deal for the debtor.

MR. SHAPIRO: A bird in the hand is better, I understand. Again, I'm -- I don't mean to harp on it. I'm still trying to make sure we don't have to come back to you and bother you. I'm assuming professionals can get through the confidentiality agreement, if that's what you're requiring

gist of where I'm going with it in the general terms. I don't

want to see the debtor harmed. I -- that's the last thing that I want to see happen. But, on the other hand, I need to know -- I need to allow the Committee to be able to assert their position adequately on behalf of their constituency, and -- and I believe that that helps Mr. Felger to make his case for the debtor because --

MR. SHAPIRO: He has to make it with me, Your Honor.

I'm not -- I'm not arquing that point.

THE COURT: Well -- but I'm saying that Mr. Felger, if he is going to convince the Court that this is in the best interest of the estate -- that this financing is in the best interest that -- ultimately, that the plan proposed is, he needs to be able to convince the Court that nothing else there is better, this is the best.

I mean, yes, the debtor has the right to go forward and the debtor has exclusivity and nobody has terminated it at this time. But that still doesn't mean it's a -- it is a done deal and that the plan will get confirmed that way or the financing will be approved that way, if the Court make -- can't make the findings that it needs to, to support that. And supplying information and giving the Committee the opportunity in a very short period of time -- I mean, I -- you know, it's unfortunate, to me, that the Committee couldn't get set up further. I'm not, you know -- I mean, but it didn't happen until April 1st.

will be in touch with Mr. Felger and yourself with regard to

that. And if you think that the terms are similar and that

you think that I would probably approve it, you can agree to

that, and that's fine. And if you don't, I will be bothered

21

22

23

24

25

and I will --

MR. SHAPIRO: Then we'll come back.

THE COURT: -- jump in and do what I have to do.

I'm always available by a telephone conference. I never want attorneys to have to travel more than they have to, to come -- I mean, in a way, I'm glad that we actually are having this hearing, even though --

MR. SHAPIRO: There's no hearing, understood.

adjournment ultimately, because in this expedited process, the Court needs to know what's going on as well as everybody else. And I was -- and even though I don't want to drag everybody in here for more times than is necessary, when it came to my attention that there was a request for an adjournment that was going to be forthcoming, I still wanted to have something go forward so that the Court knows where they are. I don't want to be in a position where we finally come to hearing date, everybody shows up and I'm not sure what's on.

MR. SHAPIRO: Understood.

THE COURT: So I've heard what you have to say. I understand what you have to say, and I understand your client's position. But, ultimately, I believe the debtor has a responsibility to provide information that's being -- has been requested by the Committee.

MR. SHAPIRO: I understood. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And if you need an order to that effect,

Case 08-14631-GMB Doc 195 Filed 04/22/08 1 Entered 04/22/08 16:52:36 Desc Main 72 Document Page 7 you can submit that, Mr. Sirota and Mr. Halperin. 1 MR. HALPERIN: I don't think an order will be 2 necessary. We'll work out something with a confidentiality, 3 unless --4 SPEAKER: Your Honor, if you can just so order the 5 record, that's fine. 6 THE COURT: So order the record. 7 SPEAKER: Thank you. 8 Thank you, Your Honor. 9 SPEAKER: MR. FELGER: I guess it's -- that's all we have on 10 11 the agenda. I guess it's time to address a new date before Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: All right. Well, I also want to go over 13 a little bit with the objections to the disclosure statement. 14 But since we're -- but I'm not opposed to adjourning because I 15 think the Committee needs more time. You need to supply 16 information. I'd urge you to get that as quickly as possible, 17 18 Mr. Felger. Because, again, if you want to take the position 19 -- if the debtor's position is at the end of, you know, this 20 21 process or whatever, that this is the best deal and this works best and it should be approved, this is the best financing for 22 the reasons that you've set forth before and whatever else you 23

But I want to be certain that when that comes on,

want to present, you're more than welcome to bring that.

24

parties agree that that confidentiality will continue and they

want that to be approved by the Court and everybody is in

24

agreement, I don't have a problem with that. If, instead, the
debtor wants a new confidentiality agreement, that's fine,

too. Just get it done quickly, get it finalized, so that the
documents can be provided, hopefully, within the next day or

I mean, that's what I'm hoping for.

so.

MR. BRODY: Your Honor, and that's exactly, exactly my -- my concern. What we've heard today is Arch arguing the debtor's points. And I was fearful that the delay in getting a confidentiality agreement from the debtors because we haven't had responses from anything from them. And then to get the documents --

THE COURT: Well, let me -- let's pick a hearing date that we're going to come back. Then we'll back everything up with when everything has to be provided.

MR. BRODY: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. FELGER: Your Honor, can I just -- can I just clarify the record. We've had a conference call with HIG.

I've had a number of telephone conversations with Mr. Brody.

We've had email exchanges. I -- I don't want the Court to -to have the mis -- misconception, misperception that we haven't spoken with them. I've had a number of conversations with Mr. -- Mr. Brody.

MR. BRODY: Well, I'm not saying we hadn't spoke.

I'm sorry, Mr. Felger, if I -- I meant it that way. Of course
we spoke because we never received any comments to any of our

Case 08-14631-GMB Doc 195 Filed 04/22/08 1 Entered 04/22/08 16:52:36 Desc Main 75 Document Page 75 d documents or our document requests. 1 THE COURT: All right. Let's get past that for 2 I'm not taking testimony on anybody. I'm confident, 3 my knowledge of the attorneys who appear before me and I --4 I'm assuming the others that are appearing here for the first 5 time, that this can be worked out and it can be worked 6 expeditiously. So what time frame are we looking at? 7 Mr. Sirota, what do you think the Committee would 8 look for? 9 MR. SIROTA: Judge, I -- I think the problem, as we 10 were comparing calendars yesterday, is that Your Honor wasn't 11 available next Wednesday. Mr. Felger wasn't available 12 Thursday. I wasn't available Friday. And I knew it would 13 then take us --14 THE COURT: Well, I am -- I'm available next 15 Wednesday, not the Wednesday after. Next Wednesday the 23rd, 16 right? 17 SPEAKER: Yes. 18 THE COURT: I am available on next Wednesday. 19 MR. SIROTA: Unless that's too soon for the parties 20 with depositions, then I think the next day would be May 1st, 21 which would be the Thursday after Your Honor returns from --22 THE COURT: The problem with that is that -- that's 23 really going to be difficult for me because, number one, I 24

won't have been here for three days and the next day is the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Bench Bar Conference. Even if I were to miss the Bench Bar Conference, which, if it was important enough, I would, it's really going to be difficult for me to do that on the 1st. I would prefer to do it, if either the end of next week or the week after that. So --

MR. FELGER: Well, I -- I have -- my problem is, I have a mediation. I'm the mediator of a matter involving a lot of people next Thursday. I can move it and I would be prepared to move it if -- if we need to, although, it will upset a lot of people.

THE COURT: Well, you know --

MR. FELGER: And I -- and I think Mr. Patterson -- I'm recalling everybody who will need to be there. I believe Mr. Patterson has a problem next Thursday, as well. And I believe Mr. Sirota had issues on Friday.

MR. SIROTA: That -- yes, late --

THE COURT: Friday the 25th?

MR. SIROTA: Late Thursday and Friday.

THE COURT: Well, I -- I do have the 23rd.

Actually, I -- I moved something else. I had something else, but I'm going to move that around to the -- or earlier or whatever, so that I could have the 23rd available. And I guess after the 23rd, it would have to be the week of May 5th.

MR. SIROTA: Judge, I -- I think that if we -- if we said it was next Wednesday, we would all work like dogs, but

don't think we're going to be able -- assuming we're as

THE COURT: I have a trial with a pro se debtor that I have rescheduled and I have made a firm date on the 6th. I -- I mean, it's certainly not -- doesn't involve as many people as this case, but I have made this -- I've had to move this a couple times, and I've told the parties that it will

22

23

24

```
Case 08-14631-GMB Doc 195 Filed 04/22/08<sub>11</sub>Entered 04/22/08 16:52:36 Desc Main 79

Document Page 79 of 113
         not be moved from that date. I have a possibility that I
 1
         could do the 7th. I have Chapter 13's, but if -- if I can
 2
         find another courtroom to have those go forward, it's possible
 3
         that I could have that date.
 4
                    SPEAKER: Mr. Brody was just gracious enough to say
 5
         that he could have someone fill in for him the day of the
 6
         Bench Bar.
 7
                    THE COURT: Ms. Vuocolo, I think, would
 8
 9
         be --
                              She just got volunteered.
                    SPEAKER:
10
                    SPEAKER: What -- what am I standing on?
11
                    (Discussion amongst counsel about scheduling.
12
         Unable to determine who is speaking, they are speaking over
13
         one another.)
14
                    SPEAKER: What's the topic?
15
                                Interesting enough, it's -- it's whether
                    MR. BRODY:
16
         a sale should be done through a plan or through a 363.
17
                    THE COURT: So should we invite the Bench Bar here?
18
                    SPEAKER: We could have it here, Your Honor.
19
                    MR. D'AURIA: Your Honor, being the lowest ranking
20
         member in the room, I -- I hesitate to mention my
21
         participation at the Bench Bar. I'll be here.
22
                    THE COURT: All right.
23
                    MR. D'AURIA: Judge Kaplan will not be unhappy with
24
25
         me, but I'll deal with that.
```

THE COURT: Well, we wouldn't want to do that, Mr.

D'Auria. I -- I don't think the Bench Bar date is going to work. I don't think the 2nd is going to work.

SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I get -- I mean, I could -- we could do this on the 1st. I'm -- I'm just telling you that it will be difficult to -- to get everything. I -- I mean, I probably will not be able to give you my decision immediately. That's the only -- I guess it's the only day that I can find left is the 1st.

MR. SIROTA: That would be wonderful. Even if we had to wait for a decision, Judge, at least we'd get the show --

THE COURT: Because I -- you know, I'm sure that you're going to be filing things between now and then, and I'm not going to be here for a couple -- I mean, I do have a -- I mean, I have access on my BlackBerry but I don't -- the size of these documents will probably not fit on there.

MR. SIROTA: One of the conditions was that we set a time frame so that we're not getting submissions at 8:30 in the morning before --

THE COURT: All right. Perhaps that would be the way to do it. Because that's the only day I -- I think is available. I really don't want to do that, but I'm going to be forced to do that. I -- I just don't see any other day

that we have. And it is a day that I don't have anything else, and it's the only -- and I don't have any other court because I knew I was coming back and I would have things to do, so this is going to be it.

What I'll say is, we're going to have to set the deadline for filing before the -- before that week for everything that we do. So let's -- let's put it down for May 1st. Let's backtrack.

MR. FELGER: 10:00, Your Honor?

THE COURT: 10:00.

Let's backtrack back to the confidentiality agreement and the documents. I'm going to -- I'm going to order that either the parties work out an extension of what was entered into before -- and, obviously, it has to be reviewed and -- and everything. Or -- or prepare a new one and get that into place by tomorrow. You can do it this afternoon or tomorrow. And that would then -- and in the meantime, the debtor could start assembling the documents.

Is there any reason why you couldn't provide those by Monday?

MR. FELGER: I -- I don't think so. I mean, there are -- there are requests for customer information and we'll need to talk about that, but --

THE COURT: I think Mr. Brody said that wasn't crucial for right --

1 MR. BROD

MR. BRODY: Your Honor, if I can make a suggestion.

We have taken from the list, which is about a page-and-a-quarter and we parceled it out to the DIP, the DIP of the five issue things that I asked for. I think by Monday, we should have the information we asked for for the DIP and the rest of it prior to the hearing coming up. But, I think there's no reason why the limited things that we've asked for, including the ability to talk to the CIT and the borrowing base certificate, which is -- and the new budget basically --

MR. FELGER: That -- that's not a problem.

THE COURT: Those will be -- those should be provided by Monday. Let's say the balance of the documents -- and -- and you can work those out. I will be here next week, so if you need my input, you know, we could try to have a phone conference or something if you can't work it out. Let's say by Thursday the 24th. It still gives us Friday if we need to do something afterwards or we need extension or whatever else. And any pleadings I also need to be filed by the 24th, so at least I can get those and have those before I go away.

MR. SHAPIRO: And concluding the amended -- excuse me, the amended plan and disclosure statement?

THE COURT: If you want to -- if you can do that by that time, that would be fine. But anything -- I know the Committee wants to provide additional objections to the -- the financing.

MR. SIROTA: Judge, we -- we -- initially, when we were talking about a Wednesday hearing, I think the anticipation was that the amended plan and disclosure statement would be filed today. The reason I raise that is, there's going to be documents produced by the debtor and Versa to us and depositions taken. And that give us --

THE COURT: When are they scheduled, the deps?

MR. SIROTA: Well, we're -- we're about to work that through, but I --

MR. SHAPIRO: We're going -- right, so I -- I wanted to wait till after that was done. No sense amending something or have him file an objection, asking for another amendment until --

THE COURT: I just need you to do that before I go away. Because I want to see them before I go, so I can take everything with me and --

MR. SIROTA: I would ask that those pleadings be filed, since one pleading has already been filed, by Monday the 21st; their documents be produced by the 22nd. We'll then schedule depositions 23, 24, 25 or, if need be, 28 and 29. We'll work that out. But we were on a much faster track --

MR. SHAPIRO: I don't -- I don't agree to fix what Your Honor hasn't given me a list yet. The 13 objections and the objections of all the Committee by Monday, when we have a May hearing on a disclosure statement.

```
Case 08-14631-GMB Doc 195 Filed 04/22/08 1 Entered 04/22/08 16:52:36 Desc Main 84 Document Page 84 of 113
                         Document
                                  Page 8
                   MR. SIROTA: Well, until -- until today, last night,
 1
         we were told that the amended plan and disclosure statements
 2
         would be submitted to day.
 3
                   MR. SHAPIRO: I -- I never said I would submit it.
 4
                   MR. SIROTA: I was actually talking to the debtor
 5
         about it.
 6
                   MR. SHAPIRO: Yes, well, I was drafting it so --
 7
 8
         okay.
                   MR. SIROTA: Right, until we saw 12 objections and
 9
         realized we had to adjourn here.
10
11
                   MR. SHAPIRO: Until we saw 12 objections and we
12
         stopped.
                   THE COURT: All right. Well, let's -- let's --
13
                   MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. Sorry.
14
                   THE COURT: Have you had an opportunity to look over
15
         the objections?
16
                   MR. SHAPIRO: No.
17
18
                   THE COURT: No?
19
                   MR. SHAPIRO: No. We were preparing --
20
                   MR. FELGER: I -- I have not -- I certainly have not
         perused them. I flipped them.
21
                   THE COURT: How about the ones -- I mean, there's a
22
         -- there's a bunch of them, I'm going to say, that involve
23
         environmental issues. You haven't looked at those, really,
24
```

and --

the day on the 25th -- and then I would ask --

SPEAKER: For him, correct.

MR. SIROTA: Yes.

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay. Okay. And that would include

24

MR. BRODY: And Mr. Shapiro is aware of that.

THE COURT: You know what, file it, I'll look at it.

I think it --

MR. BRODY: Thank you.

THE COURT: You know, if I think your paper is warranted to be and I will consider it, it may be a good thing to get this out at the time that we're here and -- and deal with the issue.

MR. BRODY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Because that would kind of hone on that issue that you brought up, Mr. Shapiro. If the Court denies that, then the issue of the exclusivity continues. I mean, you know, it's -- it's unusual to -- to terminate exclusivity so soon, so I -- I'll need to see what they say about. I -- I wouldn't --

MR. SHAPIRO: As long as there's --

THE COURT: I'll be honest with you, Mr. Brody, even if I -- if I reduce it to the -- to the 1st, I don't know that I'll be able to decide it on the 1st. I might hear it on the 1st, but I'm not going to have a lot of time to go over this with my law clerk and get -- and get it ready for the 1st.

MR. BRODY: Your Honor, we understand --

THE COURT: But I'm -- I'm just -- I want the parties to understand, I will do my best to be prepared for whatever we have to do on the 1st, but it's -- if things change and they come in late and there's a lot of other

That should be okay with a final list, but if there are

surprises -- for example, we know who they've produced during

24

```
Case 08-14631-GMB Doc 195 Filed 04/22/08 1 Eptered 04/22/08 16:52:36 Desc Main 91
                         Document Page 91 of 113
 1
         the first day.
                         There should be a disclosure next week,
         subject to amendment, as to who they intend to call.
 2
                   THE COURT: Do you have an idea, Mr. Felger, what
 3
         you're planning to present?
 4
                   MR. FELGER: Well, I -- I haven't seen the motion to
 5
         terminate exclusivity. I mean, that could change --
 6
                   THE COURT: Well, I --
 7
                   MR. FELGER: -- change everything, so --
 8
                   THE COURT: I don't -- let me say this. If I
 9
         shorten that to that day, I don't plan to do it on testimony.
10
         I mean, if I have to have -- take testimony, there's no way I
11
         can finish -- I can do that on the 1st, if that's what the
12
         issue is. If there's legal issues, I can consider them.
13
         So --
14
                   MR. SHAPIRO: Your Honor, I'm sorry, terminating
15
         1121 is for cause, so you're going to have to have facts.
16
17
                   THE COURT: Right, I --
                   MR. SHAPIRO: So if you want to add another hearing
18
19
         now, then that's -- we hope not, so we can --
20
                   THE COURT: I just don't know -- Mr. Brody,
         honestly, I just don't know that I could -- that I'll have
21
22
         time to do that on the 1st.
23
                   MR. BRODY: We understand, Your Honor. We're just
24
         trying to create the process.
```

THE COURT: I -- I understand that, but I'm probably

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to have to put your motion on another day, even if it's after the 1st. You can make your argument, but I -- I don't think the parties can get ready for that and do the, you know, due diligence, if you want to call it that, to be ready for that -- that contested motion with --

MR. SHAPIRO: With a discovery statement and a DIP hearing.

THE COURT: Right. With the -- with the disclosure statement. And the -- and the financing, which I think will take the bulk of the time that we're there. I mean, I look at the disclosure statement hearing as whether it's adequate. And we're going to get into a little bit of that now, too.

But, you know, unless something so overwhelms me in the evidence that I find that it's patently unconfirmable, I'm just going to look at whether it has enough information to get to the next step, which is confirmation of the plan. I know some of the objections had to do with confirmability of the plan, and I don't know if that's going to happen with -- I mean, there's not testimony that's really that necessary with regard to that, but with the post-petition financing and parties' position, I know that's going to take a lengthy period of time.

And so in -- in reconsideration, I think it's better if we put your motion on another day. But you certainly can assert that you've made that motion, if -- if that's the way

mean, if you want me to try to finish this on the 1st. So I

mean, if it's -- there's 20 witnesses, it's just not going to happen. So -- but if something comes up that really, you know, says to the Committee or the debtor or Arch or HIG that there's something else that's needed, and if some other witness really needs to be heard, then supplement by the plaintiff.

Anything else that -- time-wise that we need to do? You're going to have to set up your own discovery -- your own deposition schedule.

All right. Let's spend a few minutes, Mr. Felger, just going over the objections that have been filed to the disclosure statement. And let me just indicate a few of the issues that I noted myself that have been either brought up by other parties or I felt are something that you need to -- to address. And I would -- will say that I did see the supplement to the plan, and I really didn't have enough time to really analyze it. I tried to have my law clerk look at how some of the documents may have changed.

Let me ask you a -- a substantive question here. In reviewing the financing agreement that Arch presented as part of the supplement, I didn't see as part of the secure -- security interest that -- a security incident in avoidance actions. Is that a change from the original, or did I miss that?

MR. FELGER: In the -- in the exit? You mean the

exit commitment?

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The -- the financing -- yes, the commitment --

MR. FELGER: Yeah, there were --

MR. SHAPIRO: The commitment is for exit.

MR. FELGER: Right.

MR. SHAPIRO: So at that point --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SHAPIRO: -- we're not -- there would be no

liens --

THE COURT: You haven't changed your position, that's only as to exit. Okay.

MR. SHAPIRO: Correct.

MR. FELGER: Right exactly.

THE COURT: There were -- were a number of objections that dealt with the debtor's requirements to meet the absolute priority rule in the event that 1129(b) comes into play, and I -- I'm not sure if you addressed that sufficiently, but I think you should keep that in mind to address that if it isn't.

There was also a provision in the disclosure statement and plan that provide for the extinguishment of the inner company claims, and I don't think that you adequately described the inner company claim and indicated why it's advantageous to extinguish those claims, and if there -- and

if there's reason or not reason to kind of merge those claims together, which is, essentially, what the debtor is doing.

Are there -- are the claims of one entity significantly greater than others? Are they all the same? Do they have the same creditor -- creditor claimants, any of those things. I think somebody referred to it -- one of the objections referred to it as kind of a substantive consolidation without explanation.

MR. FELGER: Yeah, we're -- we're not substantively consolidating the entities.

THE COURT: Well -- but -- but I think that you need to --

MR. FELGER: But I -- I understand your point.

THE COURT: -- specifically address, as far as disclosure, as to why that -- that is an appropriate procedure and information as to what those claims are and -- and why they're addressed the way they are.

MR. FELGER: Okay. Understood.

THE COURT: Class 8 I'm going to call environmental class. It involves the DEP and EPA. I didn't find any detailed explanation about, number one, what the basis of the environmental liability of the debtors is; why the amount that's being proposed is appropriate to deal with that. Does that pay it in full? Does it pay it in part? Does the debtor have any continuing liability? Will those regulatory

1 auth

authorities have any ability to proceed in the future and what

their claims are. And what about the other parties that have

filed a slue of objections that I assume are related to those

environmental issues, but I can't tell because I don't think

the debtor has disclosed enough about those.

Okay. What is the interest of Crown Credit? They are -- they're a class --

MR. FELGER: Purchase money security interest holder.

THE COURT: For certain particular equipment?

MR. FELGER: Yes.

ask you that question because it should be explained as to what -- what that entity is. Each class should -- should be clear -- that was one that I didn't really know what they were. You need to explain the claim -- each claim class and -- and what it encompasses. I noted on the docket, there was one notice of reclamation filed, and I didn't see anything in the plan that dealt with reclamation claims, if there are any, if they're valid, how the debtor will deal with them, if -- and so on.

So I think you need to deal with that. I also didn't see any list -- there's a section that deals with disputed claims but nothing that designates which claims are disputed and the amounts of those claims and --

MR. FELGER: Yeah, we have that issue under the local rule because we're --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. FELGER: -- proceeding in -- in advance of the Bar date.

THE COURT: Well, I understand that, but -- but here's the reason for that local rule, so I can explain why -- why we Judges felt that that was important. It's hard for somebody to vote if they don't know if they're claim is disputed or not. You know, a creditor may have a million dollar claim and say, okay, I'm -- I'm happy with 10 percent or 2 percent or whatever it is. But if they don't know what they're claim is, then there's no way they can -- they can make an adequate determination of whether their claim is potentially substantially less than it was.

So I think that the debtor, even though all the claims haven't been filed, since you've got the debtor's list of claims, needs to at least give their best estimate of -- of what the claims are, of what the validity is, and of the -- of the basis for objecting to claims that they believe are disputed. Since you may not know what they are, you can make it, I guess, an estimate. We expect the claim to be X, even though they haven't filed a claim yet. This is how we scheduled them, and since they haven't disputed that, we're going to go by what we believe it is, but it's disputed

because or it's disputed in this amount, so that that creditor at least has notice that their claim is going to be disputed, and they can take that into consideration when they make a determination of how to vote on the plan.

I know there's -- there's a lot of issues which I noted down about the releases. I'm not sure it needs more disclosure. I guess maybe perhaps why the debtor believes that this negative notice -- which is the way I'm going to call it -- is in the best way to deal with the current case law dealing with, without making a legal conclusion, but just factually why you believe that this, I guess, meets what the debtor needs to show, and this is a fair way to proceed to -- to get to that point.

And -- and I think you could use a little more disclosure with regard to the -- what you referred to as the optional release provisions as to why you think that the amount that's being offered there is sufficient consideration for what's being asked the creditors to do with that, which is, essentially, a consent to the releases to share \$100,000, if I understand correctly. And --

MR. FELGER: That's correct.

THE COURT: -- you know, in my rough calculation, a million dollar claim would get like one cent. So, you know, I -- you need to address why that -- why that's a good -- you know, why creditors should believe that that's appropriate.

Case 08-14631-GMB Doc 195 Filed 04/22/08 1 15 Tiled 04/22/08 16:52:36 Desc Main Document Page 100 of 113

MR. FELGER: Understood, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm not going to get into all the -- the issues, but I think when you're asking in the release section in the exculpation, again, why the debtor believes that this is in the -- in the benefit of the creditors, and they should vote for it. If the answer is, this is the only way it works, well, maybe that's the answer.

But I think that that's -- that needs to be -- we're talking about adequacy here. We're talking about disclosure and information for creditors to make an informed decision. I think you need to explain why the debtor believes this is appropriate.

MR. FELGER: Right.

THE COURT: You filed the late -- you filed that late supplement, which addresses some of the issues. I didn't really have time to go over all of it. I think some of that maybe should be part of the disclosure statement and not just part of the plan. So in your -- when you're going over this -- for example, liquidation analysis, that should be part of disclosure, not just a supplement to the plan. And, although you refer to it, I mean, a creditor should be able to hold that disclosure statement as well as the plan --

MR. FELGER: Right.

THE COURT: -- and know exactly what the debtor is offering, what's being asked and -- and be adequate in order

to make a determination based on that. So I'd like you to look that over and see if some of that documentation doesn't belong in the disclosure statement.

MR. FELGER: So what we -- what we would do is we'd attach the plan as an exhibit to the disclosure statement and the liquidation analysis would be --

THE COURT: Okay. And refer to --

MR. FELGER: -- an exhibit to the -- and exhibit to the exhibit.

THE COURT: -- that exhibit in your -- in your plan
-- in your disclosure statement. That would be fine, as long
as -- as long as it's easy to -- to put -- the creditor to put
their hands on it.

MR. FELGER: Certainly.

THE COURT: Collective bargaining agreements. I really didn't see much disclosure about that at all, and I have concern about their -- I didn't hear anybody respond today that they're here representing any of the unions. I know there's a lot of nonunion employees, but there's also union employees. It's kind of a vague assertion that we're going to try to work this out, and if not, we're going to reject.

Well, if you need to reject, can you meet the standards that the codes requires in order to reject and why you think that that's appropriate, and what the debtor's

position in a lot more detail that's there. I think that those creditors definitely need and require detailed explanation so they can make a determination of whether they can vote on this plan, whether they oppose the plan, and -- and how it affects them and the members of their -- their union.

MR. FELGER: We'll do that. The -- the parties are in negotiations, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Well -- and if you're not at the point where you've resolved your negotiations, I think you at least have to give more of a disclosure than you have as to how you're going to implement that. And you -- it can be alternatively. We're going to work this out by -- I mean, I don't know what the debtor's -- I can't tell from it what the debtor's position is.

Does the debtor think they're going to keep these collective bargaining agreements? Are they going to modify these collective bargaining agreements? Are they going to reject them? And if they do one of those three things, how does that affect that union, that -- that agreement and whether it meets the code provisions. I found it was -- your disclosure statement was very lacking in that area.

Although this is part of the -- the avoidance action lien that you're proposing to give to the creditor as part of the -- the post-petition financing, I guess maybe by the time

Case 08-14631-GMB Doc 195 Filed 04/22/08 1 152:36 Desc Main 103 Document Page 103 of 113

they vote on the plan -- on the plan, that might be a done deal, I don't know. But I think that the fact that these avoidance actions that would belong to the estate by virtue of the filing of the bankruptcy that had been pledged by the debtor to Arch's part of the financing, I think that needs to be disclosed to the creditors that that's not going to be there if the post-petition financing, as has been proposed, is approved. And the plan provides that they would not have this asset.

Anybody that wants to add to what I mentioned?

MR. SIROTA: Judge, I would just ask on your last point that it be accompanied with some sort of economic statement. Do they know what the potential preferences are in avoidances actions, and creditors should know that --

THE COURT: To the best that the debtor can -- can ascertain what they think that is.

MR. SIROTA: But I think, most importantly, there has to be an explanation that there's been a proposal made that, in fact, a -- a plan --

THE COURT: Oh, that was another -- that was -- that was your issue, not mine.

MR. SIROTA: -- a plan has been filed and HIG has stepped forward, so creditors can see in black and white what the debtor is suggesting and what the debtor prevented.

THE COURT: Right, I -- I agree with Mr. Sirota that

that needs to be disclosed. Certainly, the debtor can take the position that it's not as good an offer, that it's better to go with the -- the offer they have for the reasons they think. But that's -- this is disclosure of information that creditors need to make a meaningful determination, Mr. Shapiro. And I think --

MR. SHAPIRO: I -- I agree, but -- if you're saying that if assuming for the moment you're not terminating exclusivity, we're not going to have a solicitation of two plans at the same time. If you're attaching a competing plan and then saying --

THE COURT: No, I -- I don't say he --

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay.

THE COURT: -- has to attached a competing plan. He can just say that the debtor has received this offer to do whatever it is. And I'm not even sure what it is. But -- but the debtor has reviewed it and believes that it is not in the -- is not as good a deal as the deal that's before.

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay.

THE COURT: I'm asking for -- this is -- the purpose of this is disclosure. If the debtor takes the position that the proposal as it -- as it needs -- as it sees it is there, a creditor then has the ability to then look forward, ask for more information, go to the Committee, come to the debtor, do whatever it needs to do. They need to know it exists. The

debtor can take the position this is their disclosure statement and plan and this is not as good, but that is information that I believe that a creditor needs to have in order to make a determination.

MR. SIROTA: To avoid, you know, a debate on that issue at the hearing and to minimize debates, I'd be more than glad -- we'd be more than glad if Mr. Felger would send us his draft of what he plans to say, and we'll try to work on something consensual. If we can't resolve it, Your Honor will.

MR. FELGER: That's fine.

THE COURT: Mr. D'Auria?

MR. D'AURIA: Your Honor -- Your Honor inspired a comment -- a thought on the collective bargaining agreements. I learned that the 341, that the different operating different operating debtors have different collective bargaining agreements. I just politely suggest that the debtor be mindful when working through Your Honor's comments in the collective bargaining agreements, keep the different operating debtors in mind when you talk about which agreement.

MR. FELGER: We'll do that.

THE COURT: I really -- I really feel that for the Court's knowledge, as well as the creditors, you really have to explore a lot more detail about the different entities and their creditor base and how they -- and their inter creditor

Case 08-14631-GMB Doc 195 Filed 04/22/0811 Enterted 04/22/08 16:52:36 Desc Main 106 Document Page 106 of 113 relationship in order for the Court to be able review and for 1 creditors to make a meaningful determination. 2 3 Mr. Brody? MR. BRODY: Your Honor, we would also ask in the 4 disclosure statement for the debtor to set forth how much Arch 5 is actually putting up in cash, because buried in the plan's 6 supplement is a limit to the amount of the -- and I may get 7 this one confused -- plan funder's equity contribution, which 8 9 is the first time a limit comes up. And that is important to 10 how much money is coming in to pay the different classes of 11 creditors. So how much actually is being put up by Arch, I 12 think, should be disclosed. MR. FELGER: Well, we have to satisfy feasibility, 13 so that information needs to be -- needs to be in there. 14 15 MR. BRODY: Thank you. Anybody else? 16 THE COURT: 17 MS. POLLACK: Good morning, Your Honor. Pollack again for --18 19 THE COURT: Actually, afternoon by now. 20 MS. POLLACK: Oh, we've been here quite a long time. 21 I just wanted to add to your list some disclosure about the 22 insurance, particularly for environmental claimants. 23 big issue --THE COURT: Right, since everybody brought that up, 24 25 I just assumed that Mr. Felger is going to deal with those.

But you're right, yes, the extent of insurance -- to be honest, I don't even know the details. And that was a big concern I had about the environmental issues. And I think that besides whatever is pending -- and I think you have to disclose all that -- anything that's not pending that's an issue environmentally -- I don't really know the essence of the litigation that's pending. Is this a State of Federal mandated cleanup? Is that what this --

MS. POLLACK: I mean, there are several pieces of litigation and -- and cleanups that are pending. There's a -- a list of them that the debtor has provided on Schedule 4.5.

THE COURT: And is your client and some of the others -- they're also defendants in those litigations? Or is that --

MS. POLLACK: Yes, we are co-defendants with the debtor on some pieces of litigation. And there is another piece of litigation, the Puchak (phonetic) site, which we are the only defendant. And, in fact, I've been informed by the EPA that the debtor has not even been named. They are still completing their investigation, and I -- you know, we're a little curious as to why it's even listed, because they haven't even been named at all. So we have an issue with that that's separate from the other environmental claimants.

THE COURT: What do you mean, why the debtor would list them --

I'm sorry, I said that --

THE COURT: -- the debtor has to disclose all the

THE COURT:

environmental issues.

MR. FELGER: I apologize.

22

23

24

MR. FELGER: Yes.

THE COURT: The suits they're involved in, the claims they anticipate could be filed against them, whatever they know or anticipate or suppose or -- or deny that they're involved in but could be out there, and -- and what they think the -- I guess, liability that that would be to the debtor.

MR. FELGER: We understand, Your Honor. And --

THE COURT: And -- and, also, disclose other parties that are involved in those, so that, you know, everybody knows those. I mean, we haven't really had a lot to deal with that so far in this court, but it could become a -- an issue.

MR. SHAPIRO: With one issue that was replete in each of the environmentals, some of the litigation has been going on for 17 years. They've had discovery requests for the debtor well before this case started. A lot of them are asking for information on the insurance. All I can say is, the debtor will give them the information that they have on the insurance. But some of these legacy policies since this company was formed in '52, we -- you can only disclose what you know, and after that --

THE COURT: Well, and that's -- that's what the debtor has to do.

MR. SHAPIRO: Okay.

THE COURT: The debtor has to disclose what is knows.

penalties on outstanding taxes that the pre-petition imposed.

I've been in touch with everybody and I will continue to do so

MR. BRODY: Thank you.

Case	08-14631-GMB Doc 195 Filed 04/22/08 Entered 04/22/08 16:52:36 Desc Main 113
1	THE COURT: Okay. Anything else? All right. If
2	you need me you need to put any of this into the form of an
3	order and submit it. If not, we'll go by what's on the
4	record.
5	SPEAKER: So ordered.
6	SPEAKER: I think I think we're comfortable with
7	the record.
8	SPEAKER: So order the record, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Thank you.
10	SPEAKER: Judge, thank you.
11	SPEAKER: Thank you, Your Honor.
12	* * * *
13	
14	<u>CERTIFICATION</u>
15	We, Frances Maristch and Brenda Boulden, court
16	approved transcribers, certify that the foregoing is a correct
17	transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the
18	proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
19	
20	
21	04/21/08 June 2 Maistr
22	DATE FRANCES L. MARISTCH
23	Breid Bredle
24	BRENDA BOULDEN

DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING